

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Rutherford High School	District Name: Bay
Principal: Coy Pilson	Superintendent: William Husfelt
SAC Chair: Col. Doyle	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

[School Grades Trend Data](#) (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data](#) (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

[High School Feedback Report](#)

[K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan](#)

Administrators

List your school’s administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Coy Pilson	Ed Leadership K-12	0	10	Mr. Pilson came to Rutherford in July 2012 from Mosley High School where he served as an Administrative Assistant for 11/2 years. He has served in two other states (Virginia and California) as an Asst. Principal.
Assistant Principal	Elizabeth Patterson	Social Sciences 6-12 Business 6-12 Ed. Leadership K-12	12	1	2008 School Grade B , 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					<p>2009 School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69% making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2010 School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2011 School Grade B; Ms. Patterson joined the administrative staff in June 2011. She was a teacher at the school with 9 plus years on the school improvement team as well as other state and district leadership roles. 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing. 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010 in writing, 42% Making high standards in Science.</p> <p>2012-School Grade is pending. <u>Reading:</u> The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.) <u>Writing:</u> Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above. <u>Algebra I:</u> Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. <u>Geometry:</u> Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested. <u>Biology EOC:</u> In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: <u>9th grade scores:</u> 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; <u>10th grade scores:</u> 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%</p>
Administrative Assistant	Vera Banks	Elem. Ed. 1-6 MG Gen. Science 5-9 Gifted	16	17	<p>2008 School Grade B, 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.</p> <p>2009 School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69% making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2010 School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					<p>in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2011 School Grade B: 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing, 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010, 42% Making proficiency in Science.</p> <p>2012-School Grade is pending. Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.) Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5or above and 23% (76) scoring a4.0 or above. Algebra I: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers.1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested. Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were:<u>9th grade scores:</u> 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; <u>10th grade scores:</u> 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%</p>
Administ rative Assistant	Jerry Lassiter	MG Math 5-9	14	15	<p>2008 School Grade B, 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.</p> <p>2009 School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69% making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2010 School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science</p> <p>2011 School Grade B: 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing, 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010, 42% Making proficiency in Science.</p> <p>2012 Mr. Lassiter served at Surfside Middle School in the 2011 - 2012 School year. He is back at Rutherford High School as an Administrative Assistant for the 2012-2012 school year. Surfside was a A school in 2011-2012.</p>

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Kathy Fontaine	BA-early childhood Education/Elementary, MA-Reading, Ed.S.- Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership. Ctf.: Early Childhood, elementary, Reading K-12, and Ed. Leadership K-12, ESOL endorsed	3 years and is the District Literacy Coach for the last two years	3	Each year since 2007 using Safe Harbor in Reading, there have been gains towards AYP of the bottom quartile. <u>2011</u> 79% made AYP whereas in 2010 85% made AYP. This is a 4% decrease.
Literacy Coach on Site	Terri Lowe	BA English Ed. MA Reading and Lang. Arts., English 6-12, Reading K-12	1	1	<u>2009-2010</u> 76% making high standards in Reading, 61% making learning gains, 55% lower 25 making learning gains, no AYP
Literacy Coach on Site but shared with other schools	Jennifer Rogers	Social Science 6-12, ESE K-12, Elementary Ed, ESOL endorsed, Reading Endorsed, NB-ESE Pre-K thru 12	7 th year at RHS (19 th year in education)	1	Ms. Rogers worked at Rutherford High School as an ESE and Reading Teacher for 9 years. In the 2011 – 2012 school year she accepted the position as Literacy Coach for Rutherford High School. <u>2012-School Grade is pending.</u> <i>Reading:</i> The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.) <i>Writing:</i> Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above. <i>Algebra 1:</i> Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. <i>Geometry:</i> Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1 st third – 26%; 2 nd third – 42%; 3 rd third – 33%. 307 students tested. <i>Biology EOC:</i> In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

					of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3 rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: <u>9th grade scores</u> ; 1 st third – 11%; 2 nd third – 35%; 3 rd third – 54%; <u>10th grade scores</u> ; 1 st third – 47%; 2 nd third – 36%; 3 rd third – 17%
RTI	Kelly Chisholm	SLD K-12 English 6-12 Reading Endorsement K-12 Varying Exceptionalities National Board Certification in Young Adult Varying Exceptionalities	13	1	<p>RTI (MTSS) Coach assigned to several schools including Rutherford High School to help transition to the new student support processes for struggling students in 2011-2012.</p> <p><u>2012-School Grade is pending.</u> <u>Reading:</u> The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.) <u>Writing:</u> Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above. <u>Algebra I:</u> Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. <u>Geometry:</u> Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested. <u>Biology EOC:</u> In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: <u>9th grade scores</u>; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; <u>10th grade scores</u>; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%</p>

Highly Effective Teachers

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, highly effective teachers to the school.

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruitment: Rutherford targets the hiring of highly qualified teachers by providing a safe and orderly work environment where new teachers are provided with veteran staff as mentors, support in disciplinary and intervention situations with students, time for teacher collaboration, and on-site, job-embedded professional development.	Administration	Ongoing
2. Retention: To prevent teacher turnover, our school will offer once a month meetings for new teachers (0 to 3 years) to discuss areas of concern and individualized support.	Administration	Ongoing

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

3. Retention: Our district provides a teacher induction program that trains new teachers after school on various topics to assist in retaining these teachers.	District Human Resources	Ongoing
4. Recruitment: Rutherford targets the hiring of highly qualified teachers . This will when appropriate include veteran teachers from other schools. We also utilize the SearchSoft personnel tracking system to review credentials and references on all applicants to ensure the best fit for our school. Teachers are interviewed during the application process.	Administration	Ongoing
5. Retention: All of our Alternative Certification teachers are mentored by an district provided Alternative Certification Instructional Specialist	District Alternative Certification Instructional Specialist	Ongoing
6. ESOL Endorsement, Reading Endorsement , and New Teacher Evaluation Training opportunities are provided to all staff members via Bay District initiatives.	District Professional Development leadership/Teacher Evaluation Videos online.	Ongoing
7. Department Heads work with all teachers in their department to offer training and support	Department Heads	Ongoing

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
3 teachers/0 paraprofessionals	The teachers are working with a district new teacher mentor/they are working with a district alternative certification mentor/they have been assigned a mentor (dept. head or Literacy Coach) at the school. The teachers will attend a once a month school based new teacher meeting to address any concerns that they may have.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	The teachers will take on line Beacon Courses to meet the infield requirements.
--	---

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	---	--	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school’s teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Department Heads at RHS or Lead Teacher in an area.	Teachers with 0 to 3 years experience	As part of the department head’s job description, they are role models, mentors, coaches and a support team for members of their departments.	Monthly Meetings/Individual Meetings as required. Model best practices, observations, feedback on practices, assistance with resources and communication.
Administration	Teachers with 0 to 3 years experience	To build relationships with our new teachers	Monthly meetings to discuss any issues needed and to offer further support so as to build a strong educational and professional culture.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A
Title I, Part C- Migrant
Title I, Part D
Title II
Title III
Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) /Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RTI Leadership team consists of the District MTSS Coordinator for secondary schools Kelly Chisolm. Administrators Assistant Principals of Guidance Doug lee and Assistant Principal of Curriculum Beth Patterson. The Literacy Coach Jennifer Rogers. Content Area Specialists: Karen Harrell (Math Dept. Head), Cathy Rutland (English Dept. Head), Jennifer Alvis (Science Dept. Head)

Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS team will meet on a monthly basis to review school data from a variety of sources. The MTSS team will evaluate the progress of students identified as Tier II and Tier III students and their progress. The MTSS team will work with the Child Study Team to identify students that may require interventions and begin the implementation stage of the problem solving process as well as working with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS team will meet on a monthly basis to review school data from a variety of sources. The MTSS team will evaluate the progress of students identified as Tier II and Tier III students and their progress. The MTSS team will work with the Child Study Team to identify students that may require interventions and begin the implementation stage of the problem solving process as well as working with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS

MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Data sources will include the Discovery Education Assessment (our progress monitoring program) , FCAT, Classworks, Classroom grades, and other data as needed.

Data Boards in the professional development room will be created to show each 9th and 10th grade (and retake) students baseline, mid-year, and readiness before the end of year testing placement individually so that their progress can be visually monitored.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

MTSS Support Training will be provided at In-services (district and school based), by the high school district MTSS specialist Kelly Chisolm as needed and through the introductory six hour course to RtI online at <http://www.florida-rti.org/> for new members to the team. All department head meetings will be held in the Data Room as well as professional development to focus school decisions on data and student progress.

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The administration will provide common planning opportunities for all the MTSS team members to meet and the materials to support their endeavors as needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).). Beth Patterson (Asst. Principal), Jennifer Rogers (Literacy Coach), Aishia McQueen (Reading Dept. Head), DaShoan Olds (math teacher), Jennifer Alvis (science Dept. Head), Sherry Taylor –Butler(ESE Dept. Head), Cathy Rutland (English Dept. Head, Beth Young (social studies teacher), Cecilia Leathers (Foreign Language Teacher),T. Brown (reading teacher), Millie Carlisle (Reading Teacher), Grace Alford (Reading Teacher) Bonnie Peden (CTE and Reading Representative); and Deborah Hudson (Reading Teacher).

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The LLT meets monthly to discuss data, implement ideas and programs to promote reading among the students and across the curriculum, and to discuss the literacy standards/strategies for literacy instruction across the curriculum.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

1. We will focus on a mentoring program for reading classes which will reach out to local churches, the military base, and members of the community.
2. The Literacy Team will sponsor a book fair at the school and invite local authors to talk to students during Literacy Week.
3. The team will continue to work on increasing the impact and implementation of several programs developed in the previous year (Stop/Drop/Read, FCAT Celebration, Summer Reading List, etc.).

Public School Choice

- **Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the “Upload” page.

**Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition*

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

**Grades 6-12 Only* Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Students read in all subjects and in all classes. Our plan is to develop content-specific reading activities to be used in every discipline. First the Literacy Coach in cooperation with the English Dept. Head, the Math Dept. Head and the CTE Dept. Head will create reading activities and strategies for our Physical Education, CTE, Art and Music classes. These classes will complete informational reading assignments and writing assignments in narrative, informational, and argumentative style. Each 9 weeks students will be assessed over one of these areas. 1st 9weeks: Narrative, 2nd 9weeks: Informational, 3rd 9weeks: Argumentative, 4th 9weeks: Integration of methods.

Training will be provided for content area teachers who desire assistance with these reading strategies.

**High Schools Only*

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future?

Our school is committed to offering more Career Technical Courses which give students the opportunity to earn skill certificates enabling them to apply their education directly to the world of work. These certifications offer students entry level credentials for career areas of their interest. The Rutherford Academy programs and Career and Technical classes began in the 2010 – 2011 school year to have students study for, sit, take and pass certification exams with incredible results. In the 2011-2012 year these CTE programs continued to expand opportunities for students in their programs.

Culinary Academy: Our Culinary Arts program feeds directly to the Community College where there is a wonderful Culinary Arts program and Cafe. Our community has a strong "tourism" industry and as a result the "Culinary" programs in our community are important.

Year 1: (2010 – 2011) In the Culinary Academy 41 students attempted (food prep) certifications, 30 passed.

Year 2: (2011 - 2012) In the Culinary Academy *****

The Communications Technology Academy: The ComTech program is a Bay District Cape Academy Program and operates as a magnet program with in Rutherford High School. This program has served students at Rutherford High School for almost 17 years. A core set of teachers integrate English, history and compute/Adobe courses with focuses on the same topics. (Ex. Students may be studying France in history, while in English look at short stories by a French author and then recreating a map of France or a travel brochure in computers.) Students in this Cape Academy enter in the 9th grade and exit in the 12th grade with the opportunity to take several Dual Enrolled courses, receive certification in differing Adobe products/and video editing (premiere) as well as other certifications through their elective interests.

Year 1: (2010 - 2011) 17 students attempted certification in Adobe Photoshop, 6 passed

Year 2: (2011- 2012)) The two CTE instructors passed their Adobe Certified

The Business Department: This department has offered all students at Rutheford High School opportunities to take business/adobe/computer based

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

programs to help develop 21st Century Students.

Year 1: (2010 – 2011) 21 students attempt an Adobe Certified Associate Certification and 6 students passed

Year 2: (2011- 2012) The two CTE instructors passed their Adobe Certified Associate Certification and ___ students

Drafting: This program received a total makeover in the 2010 -2011 school year. Refurbished drafting desks from another school who chose to discontinue their drafting program were brought to Rutherford High School and computers and software were updated to the newest CAD offerings. This program needed to be updated to meet the changing demands of this career field. Our community has a need for CAD skills in our community which supports two military bases. Tyndall AFB and the Navy Research Base both utilize engineers and individuals with drafting skills.

Year 1: (2010- 2011) The instructor and Students gained familiarity with the program.

Year 2: (2011-2012) The instructor and students took and passed certification in this field.

Robotics: The robotics program at Rutherford High School is presently supported by our IB/Physics/Science students in and out of classes. This program which was begun two years ago, has grown in numbers, community support, and student interest. This year's science teachers took part in a Bioscopes stem focused three week program to support the growth of Science/Math/Engineering skills in our school. They will be participating in training, lesson studies, and C-Palms development of lessons to be used across the state of Florida. The combination of two state of the art Hospitals(Bay and Gulf Coast Medical Facilities), community science growth businesses like ARA, SAIC, Lockheed Martin etc and the two military bases (Tyndall- Air Force and the Navy Research Station require an educational system to support their employment needs in terms of skills, knowledge, and interests.

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

Guidance works with students on their individual course selection based on career choices. Students choose courses each year and the master schedule is based on those selections and the state requirements. Select students have mentors comprised of community members who visit with them each week to ensure they stay in school and attend to their academics. We have academics that offer Career and Technical Certifications. Colleges, Military and Community members are invited into the school and students may sign up to have conferences with these representatives.

Elective courses that are offered to students for future employment or job skill training include: Blueprint for Professional Success, Culinary Operations I-IV, Television Production I-IV, Marketing I-III, Marketing Co-op, Computer Programming I-III, Computer Applications I-II, Drafting I-III, Web Design I-II, Communication's Technology Academy, Air Force JROTC, and Internships.

Students are encouraged to select these classes through their guidance counselors and homeroom teachers. Students are also exposed to these elective courses throughout the year as the classes participate in school wide activities. Students are recruited yearly to participate in an employment tour around the city to visit the main employers. We encourage the community to come and recruit students for jobs and internships.

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#).

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

- Fostering student/teacher communication regarding graduation requirements, scholarships, career opportunities and counseling. All will be achieved through guidance department and homeroom teachers.
- Provide PERT TEST to determine college readiness for math and language courses
- Collaborate with local businesses to provide students with job explorations through internships and Co-op opportunities.
- The Culinary program, Communications Technology Academy, Co-Op Program, Drafting Program, and Business classes offer students the ability to receive job training skills and certifications.
- Both the AP and IB programs are offered to provide students with access to college rigor courses and college credit based on their ability to pass the College Placement Courses and the IB Subject Area Test. These opportunities allow students to gain college credit and confidence in a high school setting where the college rigor and assignments experiences are supported by a familiar educational system.
- Dual Enrollment courses are being offered in the Culinary Academy (Food and Preparation), ComTech (Dual Enrolled English) and Life Sciences(Biology and Biology Lab)
- Guidance works with students on their individual course selection based on career choices. Students choose courses each year and the master schedule is based on those selections and the state requirements. Select students have mentors comprised of community members who visit with them each month to ensure they stay in school and attend to their academics. We have academics that offer vocational components and certification. Colleges, Military and Community members are invited into the school and students may sign up to have conferences with these representatives.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Reading Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.			IA.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	IA.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar prof. developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	IA.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	IA.1.DEA reports/Classworks	IA.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
9th and 10th grade students will increase their reading scores for levels 3-5 by 3%	9th -49 10th - 47	9th -52% 10th - 50%					

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

9th grade 49% (318) 10 th grade 47% (318) <i>Note: All level 1 and Level 2 readers are in reading classes. Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>			1A.2. Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms	1A.2. Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	1A.2. Administration/Literacy Coach	1A.2. DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	1A.2. Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			1A.3. Budgetary constraints	1A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge), QAR's and information on the movement to Common Core	1A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques. QAR's that reflect this movement to more complex text, and the movement to Common Core and its impact on instruction.	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, QAR's
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.			1B.1. N/A too few students (7)	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Reading Goal #1B: Reading Goal #1 Level 1-0% (0) Level 2-14% (1) Level 3-0% (0) Level 4-0% (0) Level 5-14% (2) Level 6-0% (0) Level 7-43% (3) Level 8-14% (1) Level 9-0% (0) Average score of 637. (7 students) <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 2	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 3	1B.2. N/A too few students (7)	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3. N/A too few students (7).	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 in reading.			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar professional developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	2A.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #2A: 9 th grade 26% (83) of students scored at or above level 4 in reading. 10 th grade 25% (80) of students scored at or above a level 4 in reading <i>Note: All level 1 and Level 2 readers are in reading classes</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance: 9 th -26% 10 th -25%	2013 Expected Level of Performance: 9 th -29% 10 th - 28%					
			1A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms/Lesson Study	2A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	2A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach	2A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	2A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			1A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	1A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core	1A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on instruction	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading.			2B.1. <u>N/A too few students (7)</u>	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Reading Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance: Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2B.2 <u>N/A too few students (7)</u>	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	3A.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar prof. developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	3A.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	3A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	3A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
9 th grade 46% (146) 10 th grade 43%(136) <i>Note: All level 1 and Level 2 readers are in reading classes</i>	9 th -46% 10 th -43%	9 th -49% 10 th -46%					
			3A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms	3A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	3A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach	3A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	3A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			3A.3. Budgetary constraints	3A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge)QAR’s and information on Common Core	3A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	3A.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques, QA’s and Common Cores impact on instruction.	3A.3. Lesson Plans and Professional Development Feedback Surveys, QAR’s
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.			3B.1. <u>N/A too few students (7).</u>	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.3. <u>N/A too few students (7).</u>	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	4A.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar professional developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	4A.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	4A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	43A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #4A: Learning gains were:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
9 th grade 25% (10 th grade 25%(80) <i>Note: All level 1 and Level 2 readers are in reading classes</i>	10 th -55%	10 th -58%	4A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms	4A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	4A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach	4A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	4A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			4A.3. Budgetary constraints	4A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge),QAR’s and information on Common Core	4A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	4A.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques. QAR’s that reflect that level of complexity of Webb, and instruction on Common Core and how that affects instruction.	4A.3. Lesson Plans and Professional Development Feedback Surveys,QAR’s
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1. <u>N/A too few students (7).</u>	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Reading Goal #4B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	4B.2. <u>N/A too few students (7).</u>	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.
--	--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 55% (210) 9 th graders were considered proficient in reading 48% (165) 10 th graders were considered proficient in reading	9 th grade 49%(164) 10 th grade 47%(158) White: 57% Black:34% Hispanic: 64% Asian: 75% American Indian:N/A	9 th -52% 10 th – 50% White: 68% Black:52% Hispanic:69% Asian: 83% American Indian:N/A	9 th 56% 10 th 56% White: 71% Black:57% Hispanic:734% Asian: 85% American Indian:N/A	9 th 61% 10 th 62% White: 75% Black:63% Hispanic:76% Asian: 87% American Indian:N/A	9 th 66% 10 th 67% White: 79% Black:68% Hispanic:80% Asian: 89% American Indian:N/A	9 th 70% 10 th 73% White: 80% Black:78% Hispanic:78% Asian: 100% American Indian:N/A	
	Reading Goal #5A: In 2016/2017 – 70% of 9 th grade students will be considered proficient in Reading. In 2016/2017- 73% of 10 th graders will be considered proficient in Reading							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	Reading Goal #5B: All minority groups will increase by 3%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* White: 54% Black: 31% Hispanic: 61% Asian: 72% American Indian: N/A	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* White: 57% Black:34% Hispanic: 64% Asian: 75% American Indian:N/A	5A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	5A.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar professional. developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	5A.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	5A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	5A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
			5A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms	5A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty	5A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach	5A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	5A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs	

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			meetings			
		5A.3. Budgetary constraints	5A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge),QAR's and information on Common Core	5A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	5A.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques. QAR's that reflect that level of complexity of Webb, and instruction on Common Core and how that affects instruction.	5A.3. Lesson Plans and Professional Development Feedback Surveys,QAR's

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5C.1. N/A too few students	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
Reading Goal #5C: N/A Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5D.1. N/A too few students (5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
Reading Goal #5D: N/A Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

N/A	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.			5E.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	5E.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar professional developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure the reading strategies are still embedded	5E.1.Administration/Literacy Coach	5E.1.DEA reports/Classworks	5E.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Reading Goal #5E: Economically Disadvantaged students will increase their reading scores by 3% in 2013.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* 50%	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 53%					
			5E.2. Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms	5E.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	5E.2.Administration/Literacy Coach	5E.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	5E.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			5E.3. Budgetary constraints	5E.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge),QAR’s and information on Common Core	5E.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	5E.3. Provide onsite professional development in determining text complexity and providing higher level questioning techniques. QAR’s that reflect that level of complexity of Webb, and instruction on Common Core and how that affects instruction.	5E.3. Lesson Plans and Professional Development Feedback Surveys,QAR’s

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Focus Calendar/Developed by District Reading Team and implemented by Literacy Coach	9 th and 10 th Any student who has not passed FCAT Reading	Jennifer Rogers Literacy Coach	School Wide Prof. Development in planning or common planning at the end of the day.	During planning periods or common planning at the end of the day.	Reflections/Lesson Plans	Literacy Coach/Administrators
Depth of Knowledge	ALL	Beth Patterson	All	Faculty Meeting/Learning	Reflections/Lesson Plans	Literacy Coach/Administrators
Common Core/Literacy-Reading	All	Jennifer Rogers/Beth Patterson	All	Faculty Meeting/Learning	Reflections/Lesson Plans	Literacy Coach/Administrators
Ruby Payne	ALL	District Staff	All	During planning periods and/or Common Planning time	Reflections	District Training Team.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Rams Rock Saturday School	Teachers/materials/time	Drop out Prevention	\$10,000
Success Center	Teachers/materials/time	Drop out Prevention	\$3,500
Lesson Study	Reading Teachers/Facilitator/Time/Materials	No separate funding required.	
			Subtotal: \$13,500
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Technology Training on new equipment	Teachers/trainers/materials/planning time	No funding required.	
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Prof. Dev on Reading through Focus Calendar and on Technology through district trainers assigned to RHS	Teachers/Trainers/materials/planning time	No separate funding required	
Ruby Payne (4 times in the school year)	Teachers/Trainers/materials/planning time	No separate funding required	
Depth of Knowledge Training: at faculty meetings/Data discussions at faculty meetings/no funding required.			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Reading Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

CELLA Goals		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition				
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		1.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
CELLA Goal #1 <i>N/A</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>					
		1.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		1.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		2.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #2: <i>N/A</i>	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading:					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		2.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
CELLA Goal #3: N/A	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>					
		2.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<u>N/A too few students</u>			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<u>N/A too few students</u>			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
<u>N/A too few students</u>			
			Subtotal:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A too few students			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
IA. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.	IA.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			IA.2.	IA.2.	IA.2.	IA.2.	IA.2.
			IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.	IA.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1B:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of</i>					

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

	<i>performance in this box.</i>	<i>performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Mathematics Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Mathematics Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Mathematics Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4A:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #4B:</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	Baseline data 2010-2011							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Middle School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #1A:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:</u> *	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</u> *					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Mathematics Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2A:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal #2B:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.
Mathematics Goal #3A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.
			3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Mathematics Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.
Mathematics Goal #4A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.
			4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.
Mathematics Goal #4B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years			2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
5A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2010-2011								
	Mathematics Goal #5A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.
			5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.
			5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5C:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.
			5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5D:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.
			5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.			5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.
<u>Mathematics Goal</u> #5E:	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
<i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.
			5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Mathematics Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Mathematics Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.			3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.
Mathematics Goal #3: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.
			3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.	3.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
4. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.			4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.
Mathematics Goal #4: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u> <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.
			4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Algebra 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra 1.			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.1. Department meetings, which address the difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	2A.1.Administration/Dept. Head/District Math Coordinator	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Algebra 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
51% (163) scored a level 3 or above will improve by 3% to reflect 54% by 2013.	51%	54%					
			1A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction/Lesson Study	2A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	2A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach/Lesson Study	2A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	2A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			1A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	1A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb’s Depth of Knowledge)QAR’s and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)	1A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on Math instruction	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR’s
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra 1.			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.1. Department meetings, which address the difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	2A.1.Administration/Dept. Head/District Math Coordinator	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Algebra Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
11% (35) of the							

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above will increase by 2013 to 14% who will score at or above achievement Levels 4 or 5.	11%	14%					
			1A.2. Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction/Lesson study	2A.2. Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings/Lesson Study for Algebra and Geometry core teachers/Facilitators.	2A.2. Administration/Literacy Coach/Lesson Study facilitator	2A.2. DEA reports/Classworks/students grades/Lesson Study data	2A.2. Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs/classroom lesson study walkthrough notes.
			1A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	1A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)	1A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on Math instruction	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011 On FCAT, 2011 80% (294) of the 10 th grade students will achieve proficiency on the mathematics section of the FCAT	51% (163) scored at a level 3 or above.	55% will score at level 3 or above.	60% will score at level 3 or above	65% will score at level 3 or above.	70% will score at level 3 or above	75% will score at level 3 or above.
	Algebra 1 Goal #3A: 75% of students will score a 3 or above (at proficiency) by 2016 -2017						

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3C: N/A too few students <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3C.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Algebra 1 Goal #3D: <u>N/A too few students</u> <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	3D.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
			3D.2. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra 1.			3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.
Algebra 1 Goal #3E: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.
			3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

**June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011**

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry End-of-Course Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Geometry EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.			1A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	1A.1. Department meetings, which address the difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	1A.1.Administration/Dept. Head/District Math Coordinator	1A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	1A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Geometry Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1 st third – 26% 2 nd third – 42% 3 rd third – 33%	1 st third – 26% 2 nd third – 42% 3 rd third – 33%	1 st third – 23% 2 nd third – 39% 3 rd third – 38%					
	Goal will be to reduce each of the 1st and 2nd groups by three percent and raise the third percent by 6%.						
			1A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction/Lesson Study	2A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings/Lesson Study	2A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach/Lesson Study school based or district trainer.	2A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades/Lesson study data observations	2A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs/Lesson study
			1A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	1A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)	1A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on Math instruction	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute	2A.1. Department meetings, which address the	2A.1.Administration/Dept. Head/District Math	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Geometry Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	classes	difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	Coordinator		Walkthroughs
Third group of students (highest) to increase by 5%	33%	38%			**Lesson Study		
33% (2012)			2A.2. Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction	2A.2. Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	2A.2. Administration/Literacy Coach	2A.2. DEA reports/Classworks/students grades	2A.2. Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs
			2A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	2A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)	2A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	2A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on Math instruction	2A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017		
3A. In six years, school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. Baseline data 2011-2012	1 st third – 26% 2 nd third – 42% 3 rd third – 33% White:82% Black:83% Hispanic:80% Asian:100% American Indian:N/A	1 st third – 23% 2 nd third – 39% 3 rd third – 38% White:84% Black:83% Hispanic:82% Asian:100% American Indian:N/A	1 st third – 20% 2 nd third – 41% 3 rd third – 39% White:86% Black:85% Hispanic:84% Asian:100% American Indian:	1 st third – 17% 2 nd third – 40% 3 rd third – 43% White:88% Black:87% Hispanic:87% Asian:100% American Indian:	1 st third – 15% 2 nd third – 39% 3 rd third – 45% White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:		
Geometry Goal #3A: This can be determined more accurately next year when we have students with more firm numbers; however with the data available, we can seek to reduce the 1 st third or our lowest performers to 10% and increase or 2 nd third and 3 rd third groups. 1 st third – 26% 2 nd third – 42% 3 rd third – 33%	80% Asian:100% American Indian:N/A						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"> 2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: </td> <td style="width: 50%; text-align: center;"> 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: </td> </tr> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.
2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i> White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:						

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3C.1. <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.
Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<u>N/A too few students</u>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3C.2.N <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.
			3C.3.N <u>N/A too few students</u>	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			3D.1.N <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.
Geometry Goal #3D:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<u>N/A too few students</u>	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			3D.2.N <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.
			3D.3.N <u>N/A too few students</u>	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.			BE.1.	BE.1.	BE.1.	BE.1.	BE.1.
Geometry Goal #3E: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			BE.2.	BE.2.	BE.2.	BE.2.	BE.2.
			BE.3.	BE.3.	BE.3.	BE.3.	BE.3.

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study	Algebra and Geometry	John Cannon/Beth Patterson/Jennifer Rogers/Aishia McQueen/	Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers	Fall session 1/spring session 2 Fall 2013 session 3	Reflections/lesson plans	Administration
Kagan Strategies	All	Faculty Meetings	All Faculty	Monthly	Reflections/lesson plans	Administration
Danielson Frameworks	All	Faculty Meetings/online professional development	All Faculty	Monthly	Reflections/IPDP/Evaluation Documentation	Administration

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Success Center (tutoring student/teacher/E20/20.	Teachers/Materials/Time	Dropout Prevention	\$3,500
Math Intensive Review (2/3 Saturdays before retakes	Teachers/Materials/Time	Dropout Prevention	\$1,500
Summer Math Program (Intensive Math credit)	Teachers/Materials/Time	Dropout Prevention	\$10,000
			\$15,000 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Integrate technology in class with new smart board equipment	Teachers/Materials/Time	Teacher to teacher at school.	0/00
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Lesson Study (Algebra Geometry)	Teachers/materials/time	subs	
Kagan Engagement Strategies	Faculty Meetings	None	none
Danielson Frameworks	Faculty Meetings/online	None	
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			\$15,000 Total:

End of Mathematics Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.			1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.
Science Goal #1A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
			1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Science Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.			2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.
Science Goal #2A: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.
			2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.
Science Goal #2B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* <i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.
			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

High School Science Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Science Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Science Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Biology 1 EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Biology 1.			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.1. Department meetings, which address the difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	2A.1.Administration/Dept. Head/District Math Coordinator	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs
Biology 1 Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
307 students tested. Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. 9th grade scores 1 st third – 11% 2 nd third – 35% 3 rd third – 54% 10th grade scores 1 st third – 47% 2 nd third – 36% 3 rd third – 17% Goal will be to reduce each of the 1st and 2nd groups by three percent and raise the third percent by 5%.	9th grade scores 1 st third – 11% 2 nd third – 35% 3 rd third – 54% 10th grade scores 1 st third – 47% 2 nd third – 36% 3 rd third – 17%	9th grade scores 1 st third – 9% 2 nd third – 32% 3 rd third – 59% 10th grade scores 1 st third – 44% 2 nd third – 33% 3 rd third – 23%					
			2A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction/Lesson Study through Bioscopes	2A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings/Lesson study program	2A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach/Lesson study district or school based personnel/Maggie Wentworth	2A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades/Lesson study data.	2A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs/Data evaluation of lesson study.
			2A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of	2A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more	2A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	2A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on	2A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool											
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1. Biology 1 Goal #2: 9 th grade 3 rd third – 54% 10 th grade 3 rd third – 17% To increase students scoring levels 4 and 5 by 3%.			move to Common Core)	complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)		Math instruction												
			2A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.1. Department meetings, which address the difficulties of the transition to a 45 minute class.	2A.1. Administration/Dept. Head/District Math Coordinator	2A.1.DEA reports/Classworks	2A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs											
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</th> <th>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>9th grade</td> <td>9th grade</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd third – 54%</td> <td>3rd third – 54%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10th grade</td> <td>10th grade</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3rd third – 17%</td> <td>3rd third – 17%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*	9 th grade	9 th grade	3 rd third – 54%	3 rd third – 54%	10 th grade	10 th grade	3 rd third – 17%	3 rd third – 17%	2A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms. Using data(DEA) to drive differentiated instruction/Lesson Study	2A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings/Lesson study program	2A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach/Lesson study district or school based personnel/Maggie Wentworth	2A.2.DEA reports/Classworks/students grades/Lesson study data.	2A.2.Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs/Data evaluation of lesson study.
			2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*														
9 th grade	9 th grade																	
3 rd third – 54%	3 rd third – 54%																	
10 th grade	10 th grade																	
3 rd third – 17%	3 rd third – 17%																	
2A.3. Budgetary constraints (work with resources at school and begin understanding of move to Common Core)	2A.3. Provide professional development in increasing cognitive complexity of student work and providing instruction with more complex text (Webb's Depth of Knowledge)QAR's and information on Common Core for Math (8 Elements)	2A.3. District Math Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	2A.3. Provide onsite professional development in math strategies./Answer questions about Common Core and its impact on Math instruction	2A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, and QAR's														

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

June 2012

Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Lesson Study/Through Bioscopes	9 th and 10 th grade Biology	Beth Patterson/Jennifer Rogers/Aisihi a McQueen/	Biology teachers will work together to carry out a Lesson Plan in the Biology content area once in the Fall and once in the spring.	Fall/Spring	Teachers will reflect on strategies used for instructional engagement	Maggie Wentworth/State District/School based
FCR-STEM Academy 12/5/2012	BioScopes Teachers all grades 9-12	District Personnel/STEM Academy Professionals	Bioscopes trained/teachers	Fall	Teachers will present to faculty summary and in Dept. Meetings share strategies.	Faculty Meeting Agendas Dept. Meeting minutes.
FSU-PC STEM Institute summer training	As provided for thru district/grant funds	District Personnel/STEM Academy Professionals	All science and Math teachers who would like to attend.	Summer 2013	Teachers will include knowledge in lesson plans and in Dept. Meetings.	TDY's
Showcase STEM with career instruction by STEM professionals in classrooms	9-12	Jennifer Alvis	Individuals who have STEM careers	2012- 2013	Students will write a reflection on the careers presented.	Reflections

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Success Center Biology	Teacher/materials/	Dropout prevention	\$1,500 approx.
Biology Targeted Review	Teacher review/review packets	DAT Grant	\$1,000 approx.
			\$2,500 Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
BioScopes	Materials/training/consumables	State of Florida/School	\$600.00
			\$600.00 Subtotal:

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Stem Conference	Materials/workbooks/experiences	DOD/Florida State University	Free/9,000 approx worth of training and materials.
Days to attend conferences	Substitutes		\$600.00
			\$600.00 Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			\$3,700.00 Total:

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Writing Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.			1A.1.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	1A.1. At faculty meeting, department meetings, and in Focus Calendar prof. developments have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure that writing strategies with conventions are emphasized.	1A.1.Administration/Literacy Coach/English Dept. Head	1A.1.English Dept. writing prompts data	1A.1.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs/writing prompts.
Writing Goal #1A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
<i>Students scoring at proficient will increase their scores by 3% from 74% (245) to 77%(255)</i>	74% proficient	77% proficient					
			1A.2.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms to accommodate the varied	1A.2.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	1A.2.Administration/Literacy Coach/Dept Head	1A.2.Writing samples	1A.2.Lesson plans with writing conventions/differentiation/classroom walkthroughs

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

		skills at conventions and writing.				
		1A.3. Budgetary constraints	1A.3. Provide professional development to the faculty on writing conventions and prompts to support increasing student support in the writing process.	1A.3. Literacy Coach, Administrators, Department Chairs	1A.3. Provide onsite professional development during planning periods or common planning to assist all teachers in support of state writing requirements.	1A.3. Lesson Plans, Professional Development Feedback Surveys, QAR's
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.
Writing Goal #1B: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>				
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>				
			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Support	All	English Dept Head/District Trainer	School wide/all	Fall/Winter/as faculty input requests	QAR writings/English Dept. prompts practice	English Dept. Head/Literacy Coach

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
N/A			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2014-2015)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Civics EOC Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.			1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
Civics Goal #1: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.			2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.
Civics Goal #2: <i>Enter narrative for the goal in this box.</i>	<u>2012 Current Level of Performance:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Performance:*</u>					
	<i>Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.</i>	<i>Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.</i>					
			2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
			2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Civics Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals *(required in year 2013-2014)*

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

U.S. History EOC Goals			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in U.S. History.			1A.1. There is no DEA test to support and assist teachers	1A.1. Teachers will develop or use an EOC test that they have developed.	1A.1. Social Studies Dept. Head	1A.1 Test results at the end of the year.	1A.1.EOC given for the first time to our students and their results.
U.S. History Goal #1: <i>70% of students will be proficient.</i>	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	<i>no data</i>	<i>70%</i>					
			2A.2.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.2. At faculty meeting, department meetings have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure they are on target to complete the content in the appropriate time period.	2A.2.Administration/Social Studies Dept. Head	2A.2.Teacher report progress along curriculum map/guide/Test data	2A.2.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs/dept head meeting notes.
		3A.3.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms to accommodate the varied background knowledge	3A.3.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	3A.3.Administration/Social Studies Dept. Head	3A.3. Teacher report progress along curriculum map/guide/Test data	3A.3.Lesson plans differentiation/classroom walkthroughs	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:			Anticipated Barrier				
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.			1.1. There is no DEA test to support and assist teachers	1.1. Teachers will develop or use an EOC test that they have developed.	1.1. Social Studies Dept. Head	1.1.Test results at the end of the year.	1.1.EOC given for the first time to our students and their results.
U.S. History Goal #2:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

25% at or above Achievement levels 4 and 5	0%	25%					
			2A.2.Change from block scheduling to 45 minute classes	2A.2. At faculty meeting, department meetings have teachers address difficulties and develop strategies that will encourage teachers to make sure they are on target to complete the content in the appropriate time period.	2A.2.Administration/Social Studies Dept. Head	2A2.Teacher report progress along curriculum map/guide/Test data	2A.2.Lesson Plans/Classroom Walkthroughs/dept head meeting notes.
3A.3.Teachers comfort with and ability to differentiate in their classrooms to accommodate the varied background knowledge			3A.3.Differentiated Instruction in professional development/faculty meetings	3A.3.Administration/Social Studies Dept. Head	3A.3. .Teacher report progress along curriculum map/guide/Test data	3A.3.Lesson plans differentiation/classroom walkthroughs	

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Kagan Strategies	All	AP Curriculum/Literacy Coach/Kagan classroom teachers	School-Wide	Monthly Faculty Meetings	Lesson plans/classroom walkthroughs	Administration/Dept. Heads

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Smart Technology	Smart Classroom teachers sharing in dept. meetings/across school.		
			Subtotal:0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
New Textbooks and materials (adoption year)	Provided by the publishers	Textbook fund	\$95,000
			Subtotal \$95,000

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:\$95,000

End of U.S. History Goals

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Attendance Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Increase Attendance				
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Attendance			1.1. Time to spend meeting with parents/speed of the 45 minute class/number of students in poverty so that phone access and phone numbers change sometimes monthly.	1.1. At each 4 week grading period pull an attendance report. Administrative Assistants divide the students up and call them/their parents in for a conference/in person or via phone. Refer students/parents to Child Study Team Parent Portal –encourage parents to participate through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Freshman Orientation b. Open House c. Iris alerts d. Notification via Iris when grades gout e. Parent/Teacher Conferences f. School Website 	1.1.Administrative Assistants Guidance Child Study Team Administration/school web master/teachers/guidance counselors	1.1.Contact sheets and reduced attendance problems Minutes/reduction of attendance problems SAC's and SIT minutes School Website page shot	1.1. End of year data. End of year data Increase in number of parents on Parent Portal. Increased improvement on parent communication as noted in the parent end of year survey.
Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*					
	94.87%	97%					
To increase attendance by 2.2%.	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)					
		Enter numerical data for expected number of absences in this box.					
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)					
		Enter numerical data for expected number of students tardy in this box.					
			1.3. Correct Parent Contact Information	1.3. Iris Call asking all parents to update their information by class so as not to overwhelm office staff./at parent meetings. Continually throughout the year when appropriate.	1.3. Administration/Staff/Teachers	1.3.Updated records	1.3.Teacher/administration contact records

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
None						

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Total:0.00

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Decrease Suspension				
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions,” identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Suspension			1.1. Suspensions were often a result of fighting.	1.1.Consistent consequences with clear knowledge that a pattern of fighting would constitute a disruption to the school and the student(s) would be put up for expulsion.	1.1. AA of Suspensions	1.1.Reduction in fighting at school	1.1. End of year data.
Suspension Goal #1:	2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions					
To reduce the number of suspensions by 10%	32	30					
18 Suspensions:	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended					
42 students involved	In-School	In-School					
21 Females	68 days	60 days					
21 Males	2012 Total Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
20 Caucasian	40	35					
22 Minority	2012 Total Number of Students Suspended	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended					
Students involved by grade:	Out- of- School	Out- of- School					
9 th grade – 14							
10 th grade- 18							
11 th graded –8							
12 th grade – 2							
Little In school Detention-substituted Lunch							
Detention: below are statistics.							
1 st Semester							
80% WERE DISCIPLINED							
STUDENTS ASSIGNED 120							
ASSIGNED ISS 3							
STUDENTS SERVED 83							
ASSIGNED OSS 8							
WITHDREW 2							
DID NOT SERVE 24							
			1.2 Individuals who have multiple suspensions.	1.2..Require Parent students conferences before suspended student returns to school	1.2.AA of Suspensions	1.2. Record of conference	1.2.Reduction of suspension at the end of the year.
			1.3. Individuals who are not making progress towards graduation	1.3. Offer alternative school options as appropriate to the situation	1.3. Child Study Team	1.3.Minutes of Meeting	1.3. Reduction of suspensions

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

2 ND SEMESTER 92 % WERE DISCIPLINED STUDENTS ASSIGNED 265 ASSIGNED ISS 0						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Suspension Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
None						

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)		Problem-solving Process to Dropout Prevention				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Dropout Prevention		1.1. Success Center	1.1.To offer students extra time/tutoring/materials for completing school work/getting homework help. Tutoring will be provided both by students and by teachers.	1.1.AP Curriculum	1.1. Students will use the success center.	1.1.Overall improved grades and achievement scores
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	1.3%	1%				
	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*				
			1.2. E2020 Support	1.2.To give students 2 ½ hours 4 days a week to participate in credit recovery program.	1.2.APCurriculum/Hired Staff/Guidance	1.2.Number of students who are able to recover credit.
		1.3. EOC/FCAT Intensive Review programs	1.3.To provide students with review program that emphasizes and gives practice in the areas that they will need to pass State	1.3.AP Curriculum/Literacy Coach/Dept. Heads/Faculty Members	1.3.Students who make learning gains and who pass the EOC's and FCAT 2.0	1.3.Data on achievement scores.

June 2012
Rule 6A-1.099811
Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

			of Florida tests.	in the tested areas.		
--	--	--	-------------------	----------------------	--	--

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
E2020 Training	All	AP Curriculum/teachers who work in E2020 program	Teachers who will proctor E2020 program	Fall 2012	Evaluate student pass rate with E20/20 suport	AP Curriculum

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Already subsumed in programs etc above in tested areas.			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Already subsumed in programs etc above in tested areas.			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Already subsumed in programs etc above in tested areas.			

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

				Subtotal:
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
v				
				Subtotal:
				Total:\$0.00

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section.

Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Parent Involvement Goal(s)			Problem-solving Process to Parent Involvement				
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Parent Involvement			1.1. Time concerns/multiple jobs	1.1.To send out an IRIS call asking parents to attend SACS meetings.	1.1.AP Curriculum	1.1.Number of parents who attend	1.1.Sign in sheets
<u>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</u>	<u>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>	<u>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*</u>					
To grow parent involvement by 10%.in SACS meetings	6 regular SACS members	13 Regular SACS members					
To maintain our Five Star School Volunteer Status			1.2 Opportunities to sign up	1.2.At Open House encourage parents to sign up to volunteer.	1.2. AA of Volunteers	1.2. Number of hours of parents who volunteer at the school	1.2. Volunteer hour records
To have a reading mentor program. <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>			1.3. Procedures/costs for allowing people to volunteer in schools	1.3. Literacy team to have mentors work with student in centers or one on one in classes.	1.3. Literacy Coach	1.3.Reading mentors who participate in the program	1.3.Volunteer record hours of reading mentors.

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Reading Mentors Meeting before entering the classroom	All	Literacy Coach/Reading Dept. Head	All mentors and reading teachers	Fall 2012`	Mentor feedback form	Literacy Coach/Reading Dept Head.

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

June 2012
 Rule 6A-1.099811
 Revised April 29, 2011

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
STEM Goal #1: These goals are subsumed under the science goals. There are specific and appropriate references to Stem.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of STEM Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
CTE Goal #1: To establish the Culinary Program as a Cape Academy	1.1 Time to write the grant	1.1. Have the CTE director assist Culinary Program lead teacher.	1.1. AP Curriculum/CTE Dept. Head	1.1. Acceptance of the Culinary Academy as a Cape Academy	1.1. Status as Cape Academy
	1.2. 1.1. How to schedule an academic course to share students with the Culinary Academy.	1.2. To work with guidance to develop a schedule to share students.	1.2. AP Guidance	1.2 Master schedule	1.2..Academy program development plan
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CTE Conference	ALL	CTE Director	CTE teachers	Fall/Spring	CTE report out to administration/other CTE teachers/faculty	CTE Dept. Head and CTE Director

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
CTE Budgets are a result of students passing and receiving Certifications in their field.	Certification	State	Dependent on the number of seniors who pass their certification. Students may pass and receive certification before they are seniors but the programs do not receive funding for those students until the reporting year following the students graduation from high school.
			Subtotal:
			Total: Varies

End of CTE Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s)

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g. 70% (35)).

Additional Goal(s)			Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:			Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1. Additional Goal			1.1. Time	1.1. to develop and publish times so that teachers can plan for these drills.	1.1. AA of Facilities	1.1. Record of drill and timeliness of the response of students/teachers/staff in the school.	1.1. Official drill records.
Additional Goal #1: <i>Safety Goal: In addition to the state mandated fire drills, the school will have a tornado drill, and a lock down drill</i>	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	9 Fire drills.	9 fire drills and tornado and lock down drill					
			1.2. None	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
			1.3. None	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
None						

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
None			
			Subtotal:
			Total:

End of Additional Goal(s)

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget (Combination of DAT Grant if we qualify and are awarded and Dropout Prevention Funds)	Total: \$13,500
CELLA Budget	Total:N/A
Mathematics Budget (Combination of DAT Grant if we qualify and are awarded and Dropout Prevention Funds)	Total:\$15,000
Science Budget (Combination of DAT Grant if we qualify and are awarded and Dropout Prevention Funds)	Total:\$3,700
Writing Budget (none)	Total: 0.00
Civics Budget (N/	Total:
U.S. History Budget (Textbook Adoption Year)	Total:\$95,000
Attendance Budget	Total:
Suspension Budget	Total:
Dropout Prevention Budget	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	Total:
STEM Budget	Total:
CTE Budget	Total:
Additional Goals Drop out prevention money (18,750) approx and DAT grant money (\$10,000) plus carryover of approx.\$6,000 from last year gives us the \$32,000 to run all of the programs to help support and increase student achievement. These will have to be dropped if we see a reduction in our drop out prevention funds or the DAT Grant funds.	Total:

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Grand Total:\$127,200

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent

- Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the *Upload* page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community members who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting *Yes* or *No* below.

Yes No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

The SAC's team will be doing the following this year:

- a. If funding is received, allowing students to write for classroom grants
- b. Reviewing our drop out prevention plans depending on funding and available grants that can include: Intensive Math in summer school/Sat. School FCAT reading prep/EOC prepar

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.	Amount
Teacher grants/Saturday School/Success Center	\$1,200 (if given in budget)